REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-19, 21, and 22 are pending. Claims 1 and 19 and the specification have been amended for clarification purposes.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. The Drawing Objection

The Examiner maintained the objection to the drawings on grounds that Figure 7 does not show the connection between terminal 30 and agent 710. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

In Applicants' previous reply, Figure 7 was amended to show that mobile terminal 30 may connect to agent 710 along a path "b" which extends between SGSN 120 and agent 710. From this revision, it is apparent that mobile terminal 30 connects to agent 710 along a signal path that passes through base station 150, base station controller 140, SGSN 120, and then to agent 710 along path "b." Applicants submit that this explanation identifies the elements in the signal path used to connect mobile terminal 30 to agent 710 and therefore is sufficient to overcome the drawing objection.

II. The Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to for failing to indicate how agents 710 and 720 are connected to one another. As shown in Figure 7, agents 710 and 720 may communicate directly along path 1 or indirectly through a signal path that passes through Internet 720. The

specification has been amended to indicate the same. Applicants submit that this amendment introduces no new matter since it merely conforms the specification to subject matter disclosed in the drawings as originally filed.

III. The § 112, First Paragraph, Rejection

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-19, 21, and 22 were rejected on grounds that the specification fails to provide a written description of the features in base claims 1 and 19: "each combination assigned a different security classification." This phrase has been replaced with the following phrase which is more accurately supported by the specification: "each combination having a different security classification identified based on whether predetermined information is stored in a call filter attribute field, each combination further including different arrangements of said attributes."

The specification supports this replacement phrase. For example, Table 2 on page 15 of the specification provides a list of various packet-pattern attributes. This table also identifies various combinations (e.g., valid combination I and valid combination II) of those attributes that are deemed to be valid. One of those attributes corresponds to an IPSec Security Parameter Index (SPI). As those skilled in the art understand, an SPI parameter provides an indication of whether or not a PDU was transmitted with encryption, and in some cases the SPI may also indicate what type of encryption was used.

Thus, in the context of the invention a combination of packet-pattern attributes (e.g., Valid Combination I) that does not have an SPI is indicative of one level of security classification (e.g., encryption) and a combination of packet-pattern attributes (e.g., Valid Combination II) that has an SPI is indicative of a different level of security classification (e.g., no encryption).

Withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1, 19, and their dependent claims is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

IV. The Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5-19, 21, and 22 were rejected for being obvious in view of an Uskela-Puuskari combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites the step of registering packet call filtering information that includes "a plurality of combinations of packet-pattern attributes, each combination having a different security classification identified based on whether predetermined information is stored in a call filter attribute field." A determination is then made as to whether to set a call connection based on a comparison of attributes in a received packet and the different combination of attributes including the security classification.

The Uskela patent does not teach or suggest these features. In order to make up for these deficiencies, the Puuskari publication was cited.

The Puuskari publication discloses a gateway (GGSN) which uses a filter for controlling a call in a mobile communication system. As the Examiner indicated, the filter is based on a variety of parameters including a secure parameter index IPSec. (See Paragraph [15]). However, the Puuskari method controls a call in a different way from the claimed invention based on its filter. Specifically, Puuskari controls quality of service (QoS) to be used in for a call using the security parameter in its filter. The QoS may involve assigning a higher priority to a call than another, or giving a call a different delay than another.

Importantly, however, in all cases the Puuskari method connects the call regardless of the QoS level that is assigned to the call. That is, the Puuskari method does not make a decision of whether or not to reject or terminate a call based on a security information parameter included in its filter.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "activating one of a rejection filter or a permission filter based on information stored in the packet call filtering information" and setting the call connection according to "a result of determination and the activated filter, wherein the rejection filter blocks setting of the call if the comparison of the attribute information of the received packet matches one of the plurality of combinations of the packet-pattern attributes, and the permission filter allows the call to be set if the comparison of the attribute information of the received packet does not match any of the plurality of combinations of the packet-pattern attributes."

Because each combination includes a different security classification based on whether predetermined information is stored in a call filter attribute field, it is therefore evident that claim 1 sets a call based on, at least in part, on the security classification of that combination. The Puuskari publication does not teach or suggest these features, as is only make a decision as to what level of QoS is to be used for an already-connected call, not whether or not to connect the call as recited in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing differences, Applicants submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Claim 19 recites features similar to those that patentably distinguish claim 1 from an Uskela-Puuskari combination. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 19 and its dependent claims are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: June 12, 2008
\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-609\158345.doc
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610